



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

VOL. LVIII.

BOSTON, APRIL, 1896.

No. 4.

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,
PUBLISHERS,
NO. 3 SOMERSET STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
EDITORIALS.	77-80
An Anglo-American Tribunal — A Permanent Tribunal Practicable — The Cuban Resolutions — The London Peace Demonstration.	
International Law and Peace.	80
Letter from International Arbitration Association.	81
EDITORIAL NOTES.	82-85
Conference at Washington—Senator Descamps on Arbitration — Report of International Law Association—Lord Salisbury's Letter—New York Board of Trade—Industrial Arbitration—The Outlook on Labor—Meeting at Cooper Union—Chauncey M. Depew on International Arbitration—Censuring Ambassador Bayard—Our Trade with Great Britain—European Armaments—W. C. T. U.—Cuba—Secretary's Addresses—Dr. Darby—Memoir of Patrick McGrath—Death of Dr. Magoun and others—International Woman's Congress—Venezuela Question—American Humane Society's Prize—Massachusetts Reform Club.	
International Hymn. <i>By George Huntington.</i>	85
Appeals of Missionaries for Redress. <i>By J. Hudson Taylor.</i>	86
Arbitration vs. War. <i>By Frederick R. Coudert.</i>	87
Arbitrations of the United States. <i>By Prof. J. B. Moore.</i>	89
AMONG THE MAGAZINES.	93
The Century — The North American Review—The New England Magazine.	

AN ANGLO-AMERICAN TRIBUNAL.

The simplest and most practicable plan for a treaty and a tribunal of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain which we have seen is that presented by Mr. Robert Treat Paine, President of the American Peace Society, at the Conference at Philadelphia on Washington's birthday. As the lateness of the date of the Conference and lack of space prevented our inserting this plan in our last issue, we here give it in full:

ARBITRATION TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN.

DRAFT PROPOSED BY ROBERT TREAT PAINE.

The United States of America and Great Britain adopt the Principle of Arbitration.

Any dispute between these nations which cannot be settled by diplomacy shall be referred to a

HIGH COURT OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION consisting of seven judges thus appointed for any such dispute.

The Supreme Court of the United States shall select from their own number two members.

The Supreme Court of Judicature of Great Britain shall select from their own number two members.

These four members may appoint the three other members;

Provided, however, that if they fail to complete such appointment within two months, the Government of Switzerland shall be asked to select one member, and if vacancies in the Court still exist, also to select one or two other disinterested nations—as the case may require—each of which shall be asked to select one member, these three members to be jurists eminent for wisdom, integrity and impartiality.

The decision of a majority of this Court shall be final.

The expenses of the Court, including fit salaries to the members thereof, shall be paid equally by the two nations.

The Government of Switzerland shall be asked to appoint the time and place of meeting of the Court, unless the Court shall otherwise agree.

This plan of Mr. Paine's is a development of the suggestion made by Mr. Justice Harlan, just after the adjournment of the Paris Tribunal in 1893, that hereafter all otherwise unsolvable differences between the two countries should be settled by reference to judges selected from their Supreme Courts.

Mr. Paine's plan might possibly be further simplified by providing for the appointment of six judges, three from each Supreme Court, with the provision that in case of a tie vote, which it is not likely would often if ever occur, the tribunal should name three referees from three disinterested nations. But this is only a matter of detail and does not affect the essential features of the plan.

The points in favor of this scheme are:

First, it does not create outright a permanent tribunal but only a permanent provision for a tribunal in case of need. In this way expense is avoided and likewise the difficulties which necessarily arise in the organization of a new body.

Second, it contemplates the selection of men as arbitrators who have been trained by long experience to hearing and deciding upon evidence; men also well-known, trusted and honored by their respective nations. The court would therefore have the highest confidence of both nations from the start.

Third, a tribunal thus constituted would promote friendly confidence between the two nations, because proceeding primarily on the principle that two civilized, Christian countries not only ought to settle, but can settle their differences between themselves, without appeal to others.

Finally, the plan is one easily adjustable to requirements in case other nations should wish to become parties to the tribunal.

Mr. Paine has prepared this plan with a view of promoting further critical study of the most important international question now before the minds of English-speaking peoples. We hope the subject may receive everywhere, especially among jurists and publicists, that careful and earnest consideration which its supreme importance demands.

A PERMANENT TRIBUNAL PRACTICABLE.

It is admitted by most intelligent people, who think upon the subject, that the progress of the application of judicial reasoning to the settlement of international disputes logically demands the setting up of a great international tribunal before which such disputes may be carried. Diplomacy is not sufficient. Temporary tribunals have accomplished much, but they necessarily have grave defects and fall far short of the best attainable ideal. No doubt all the disputes which have arisen between States of this Union could have been settled by negotiation or by tribunals temporarily created for the purpose, but how much simpler and more efficacious the system of a supreme court has been! The same must be true for international disputes, as soon as the application of the principles of law and equity to them is sufficiently advanced.

This is granted by most persons who think seriously about the subject. Yet two or three objections are often raised against an international tribunal, from the point of view of its practicability.

The first of these objections, and the one most frequently raised, is that there would be no power behind such a court to enforce its decisions. But this is a purely theoretical objection. It has been much dwelt on by French jurists, who are naturally given to idealistic ways of looking at things. The difficulty with the objection is that it assumes that there can be no sanctions of a law except those of force. The fact is that there are other sanctions, of conscience and honor, which are even more powerful with civilized men, and gradually make sanctions of force entirely unnecessary. This power of conscience and honor is chiefly what has enforced the decisions of our Supreme Court and rendered appeals to force entirely unnecessary. The States in establishing the Supreme Court have agreed to abide by its decisions, and they have invariably done so, "without burning an ounce of powder." Not a single one of the nearly one hundred important decisions rendered by the temporary arbitral tribunals set up for the

adjustment of international disputes during this century has had any other sanction than this of public honor and conscience and yet they have all been carried out with the utmost fidelity. The nations setting up a high court of arbitration could undoubtedly find some sanctions of force, but this would be entirely unnecessary—nay, even harmful.

Another objection is that there are questions which can not be submitted to arbitration. Those who make this objection do not specify the questions which can not be submitted, or if they do, the questions are such as could by no possibility arise between nations having taken upon themselves treaty obligations to arbitrate their differences. A patriotic Englishman is reported to have said recently, with more energy probably than thoughtfulness, that he would never consent to arbitrate about the possession of the county of Kent. Of course he would not, for he would never be asked to do so. Arbitration implies independent parties, standing over against each other, acknowledging each other's independence, respecting each other's rights as well as claiming their own. The national existence of both, with all that it presupposes, is mutually acknowledged and respected. When two nations have reached a point of civilization where they are ready and feel under moral obligation to enter into a treaty of arbitration, they have quieted between them forever all questions which can not be arbitrated.

Another objection against a permanent tribunal is that there would be no legislation to guide it, and also difficulty in deciding upon the rules under which cases should be submitted. But in the case of the temporary tribunals which have been set up suitable rules of submission have been found. There seems no reason why this could not be done in the case of a permanent tribunal. In fact, it seems that the question of rules of submission ought to be a comparatively easy one, when it was known beforehand that the dispute must go to arbitration. The objection in regard to lack of legislation is not a serious one and has not been often made. The generally accepted principles of international law would furnish some guidance. Principles of equity would be still more valuable, and the systems of law prevailing in the contracting countries would furnish the court with many generally accepted principles. The existence of the court and its settlement of even a few cases would soon have a powerful effect in reducing international law to a system, and a new body of arbitration law would gradually be built up to guide the court in its deliberations.

It is announced that the Queen Regent of Spain has been chosen by the South American Republics of Ecuador, Colombia and Peru, to act as arbitrator in determining a disputed portion of their respective boundaries. This is said to be the first instance where a woman has been called upon to act as arbitrator in an international dispute. It will not be the last one.